Manitoba
Intercultural
Council

500 - 283 Bannatyne Ave., Winnipeg, MB R3B 3B2
Ph. (204) 945-4576 Fax (204) 945-1403
Toll Free (MB) 1-800-282-8069

Conseil
interculturel
du Manitoba

283, av. Bannatyne, bureau 500, Winnipeg (MB) R3B 3B2
tél. (204) 945-4576 facs (204) 945-1403
sans frais (MB) 1-800-282-8069

PERCEPTIONS AND EVOLUTION OF MULTICULTURALISM IN CANADA: 1971 - 91

Submitted to: The Department of the Secretary of State, Multiculturalism and Citizenship

Prepared by: Sam Koshy, Executive Secretary, MIC
and
Vijay Sharma, Policy Analyst, MIC

February, 1992

The Manitoba Intercultural Council would like to acknowledge financial assistance from the Department of the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and Citizenship.

Manitoba

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT i

I. ABOUT THE MANITOBA INTERCULTURAL COUNCIL 1

II. BACKGROUND 1

A. Global 1

B. Canada 4

III. PURPOSE 6

IV. LIMITATIONS 7

V. EVOLUTION OF MULTICULTURAL POLICY 8

VI. BENEFITS OF MULTICULTURALISM 13

VII. MULTICULTURALISM AND IDEOLOGIES 16

VIII. PERCEPTIONS OF MULTICULTURALISM 17

IX. MULTICULTURALISM, THE CONSTITUTION AND THE CHARTER OF RIGHTS 25

X. MULTICULTURALISM: NEW CANADIANS, CHARTER GROUPS AND ABORIGINALS 29

XI. PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS' PERCEPTION OF MULTICULTURALISM 33

XII. THE ONGOING CHALLENGE 34

XIII. CONCLUSION 39

XIV. BIBLIOGRAPHY 44

92-07667/

ABSTRACT

The ideology/philosophy and policy of multiculturalism have been perceived and discussed in many different contexts recently. Some question the intent of multiculturalism and its results, while others are defending it.

The philosophy/ideology of multiculturalism has been vigorously debated recently in Manitoba and Canada. During many recently held public forums such as the Spicer Commission, addresses by federal and provincial elected officials, political parties, especially the Reform Party of Canada, and more recently, the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, and independent citizens have all made comments on the policy/philosophy of multiculturalism. For example, some commonly made comments state that " ... multiculturalism is divisive; it prevents people from becoming real Canadians; multiculturalism works against the unity of Canada; multicultural departments, secretariats and directorates are a waste of money ... ", and that there is "need for an open discussion and dialogue on multiculturalism: past, present and future."

It is also worthy of note that around the world multiculturalism in its various formal and informal manifestations, finds itself under increasing scrutiny and reassessment. The U.S.A., Australia, Britain, France, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union are all examples of countries now actually going through this process.

This paper will discuss the evolution of multicultural policy in Canada and illustrate the many perceptions/interpretations about it by academics, governments at all levels, and concerned citizens. The intent of this paper is to initiate discussions and create conditions leading to a common understanding of multiculturalism, to work towards replacing its present nebulous interpretations.

The challenge for the policy makers are clear - to use multiculturalism itself as a unifying factor for all communities under the umbrella of Canadian nationalism.

It is contended that multiculturalism should not be seen as an alien concept, relevant only to a small group of Canadians, but as a social and political philosophy which unites Canadians. In an era when Canadians are becoming increasingly more insecure about their cultures and feel threatened by the United States (Free Trade) or other global influences, multiculturalism could help conceptualize a unique Canadian identity.

I. ABOUT THE MANITOBA INTERCULTURAL COUNCIL

The Manitoba Intercultural Council is an agency of the Government of Manitoba, established in 1983, to provide information and advice to the government on behalf of Manitoba's ethnocultural communities. The Council represents over 40 diverse ethnic groups and over 400 ethnocultural organizations in the Province of Manitoba.

The views expressed in this report are views of the researchers of the Manitoba Intercultural Council and do not reflect the views of the Government of Manitoba, the Manitoba Intercultural Council or any one ethnocultural group.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Global

Throughout the history of human civilization, human societies could be seen as moving from homogeneity to heterogeneity. With the advance of mass communications, global travel, economic and environmental interrelatedness, as well as the process of mass migration from continent to continent has accelerated this process manyfold over the past century.

"Ethnic and racial diversity is more than ever a salient fact of the age." (Schlesinger, **TIME**, July 8, 1991, p. 14). This acceleration has necessarily and unquestionably challenged the way human beings have understood their personal and collective identities.

The challenge of identifying with people, values and cultures one has not related to or understood and certainly has not identified with as part of one's self and one's society, calls for significant readjustments in every area of human life, values and endeavours. Arthur Schlesinger notes that:

> On every side today ethnicity is breaking up nations. The Soviet Union, India, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia, are all in crisis. Ethnic tensions disturb and divide Sri Lanka, Burma, Indonesia, Iraq, Cyprus, Nigeria, Angola, Lebanon, Guyana, Trinidad ... Even nations as stable and civilized as Britain and France, Belgium and Spain, face growing ethnic troubles. (Schlesinger, **TIME**, July 8, 1991, p. 14).

Czechoslovakia

Ethnic troubles have arisen in what we still call Czechoslovakia, where an uneasy relationship between Czechs and Slovaks seems to have settled down somewhat after the federal government changed the official name of the country to the Czech and Slovak Federated Republics. (Rutter, **The Sun**, Vancouver, June 27, 1991, p. A3).

Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia had attempted to maintain strong provincial cultures within a federal system. But the rivalry of Serbs and Croats, in particular, has erupted in violent nationalism and the two provinces of Croats and Slovenia have declared themselves independent. (Rutter, **The Sun**, Vancouver, June 27, 1991, p. A3).

France

> Hardly a month goes by, particularly for some 3 million North and West Africans and their offsprings, without controversy, fanned by incendiary media coverage. A school in Creteil expels two Muslim girls for wearing head scarves, sparking a nation wide debate over religious freedom. Hundreds of mostly Arab youths riot in a Lyons suburb over race brutality. The mayor of Charvieu-Chavagneux is indicted for ordering the bulldozing of a mosque. (Hornblower, **TIME**, July 15, 1991, p. 26).

United States of America

> The United States' motto, "e pluribus unum", for more than two centuries served as the model for assimilation. Poured into the melting pot, immigrants were the ore from which was refined the mainstream of a golden land. But if you happened to be black it didn't work so well. (Rutter, **The Sun**, Vancouver, June 27, 1991, p. A3).

Canada

> The Indigenous people are organizing to resist and to demand justice and equality, while some French Canadians see separation as the only solution to their problems with Canada.

While most countries in the world are struggling with this issue on some level, certain countries, especially those who have made the decision to accept and incorporate people from other lands into their geographic borders, seem to be well ahead of the others in having to deal with this challenge consciously; often painfully. E.g., the U.S.A. and Canada.

The skill and genius with which all human beings adapt to this apparent move towards greater heterogeneity, may well be the most deciding factor in the harmonious survival of human beings on this planet.

It may help Canadians to know that they are not the only ones grappling with the thorny issues confronting a heterogeneous society.

B. Canada

Canada is faced with several major issues related to diversity: how to shape a nation-state with an overarching set of values, goals and ethos to which all of its various groups are committed; and how to structurally include diverse groups into the nation-state and assure that they experience justice and equality.

While intergroup tensions can be considered almost inevitable in a pluralistic society, it is essential that an attempt be made to try to minimize cross-ethnic conflict and strife.

New waves of immigrants, emerging events and situations due to difficult economic times, the quest by excluded ethnic groups for inclusion and equality, and the resistance to change by dominant ethnic groups are some of the factors that heighten conflict and strife.

Our nation is still in considerable shock, confusion and mourning at the death of the Meech Lake - Constitutional Talks.

During the debate, citizens' emotions were tampered with, the Aboriginal people and some women's advocacy groups questioned their status in Canada. They, and the so called "newcomers" to Canada, were denied recognition as constituting a fundamental characteristic of Canadian identity. Never before in the history of Canada, have terms such as "regionalism", "decentralization", "dismantling of Canada", and "distinct society" been used so frequently by the media, academics and politicians to express their sentiments on where Canada as a nation was heading.

Never before has our Aboriginal people and the multicultural community expressed its sentiments with such emotion: "a Meech Lake Agreement will undermine the multicultural reality of Canada", "Meech Lake agreement will tear apart the social fabric of Canada", "Meech Lake will undermine the national identity of Canada and promote regionalism and accord second class citizenship status to those who are of neither French nor English origin."

If the various issues relating to the concept of multiculturalism are not taken into account, our nation will probably never be at peace with itself.

Given the declining Canadian birth rate, the need to increase immigration to Canada and "ethnic rediscovery",[1] we can expect that multiculturalism as a concept will continue to be a subject of considerable debate.

III. PURPOSE

This paper will discuss the ideology/philosophy of multiculturalism and how it has been perceived and interpreted by Canadians since it became a formal policy in 1971, and its subsequent evolution to an Act in 1988. First, a brief background of the development and evolution of multiculturalism in Canada will be provided. Second, a range of perceptions of multiculturalism and their philosophical and ideological anchorings ranging from the ultra-conservative to liberal democratic ideologies will be discussed.

---

1 Isajiw (1983, p. 110) notes that "ethnic rediscoverers are those people often of third or consecutive generations who, for all practical purposes, have been assimilated by or socialized into the mainstream culture, who may not speak their ancestors' language at all or socialize in their ethnic community, but who develop an interest in their ancestral group and often mobilize their activities on behalf of that group within the institutions of the mainstream society."

Lastly, limitations which tend to impede the effective delivery of multicultural policy will be highlighted and suggestions made as to where the policy should be directed.

IV. LIMITATIONS

At the outset, it should be noted that this paper will not address the extreme views articulated by the Ku Klux Klan or other individuals and groups that are often referred to as xenophobic and racist.

This report takes into account the various prevalent perceptions/interpretations of multiculturalism. Emphasis will be put on citing literature which might be considered as dated. Nonetheless, we feel that such literature is pertinent as it illuminates some of the thoughts which have existed and developed over the period since the inception of the federal multicultural policy in 1971 and after the 1988 enactment of the Multicultural Act. Furthermore, it provides a context to the perceptions which have gained currency in present times.

A collection of articles on multiculturalism, as appendices, is also provided in order to give a fuller perspective on multiculturalism. Similarly, a bibliography is also provided to illustrate how various issues are increasingly being dealt with in a multicultural context. (See Appendix 1)

V. EVOLUTION OF MULTICULTURAL POLICY

The development of Canada's multicultural policy lies in the negative response by ethnic minorities to the model of bilingualism and biculturalism suggested by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the 1960's. But, as it will be discussed below, many attribute the present multicultural policy to other reasons and imperatives.

The Report of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission provided the impetus for "other ethnic" groups to unite and articulate their desire for the same recognition accorded to French and English Canadians.

To address this "ethnic" discontent with bilingualism and biculturalism, the Government of Canada in 1971, announced a "multicultural policy" within a "bilingual framework".

In one of his famous speeches on the subject in the House of Commons, Prime Minister Pierre E. Trudeau stated that, "a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework commends itself to the government as the most suitable means of assuring the cultural freedom of Canadians ... a vigorous policy of multiculturalism will help form the base of a society which is based on fair play for all." (Secretary of State, Multiculturalism, 1987, p. 9).

This policy on multiculturalism recognized and supported the following four objectives:

1) to assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada, and a clear need for assistance;

2) to assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society;

3) to promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interest of national unity; and

4) to continue assistance to immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian Society. (Canada, House of Commons, Debates, statement of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, (October 8, 1971).

However, Lupul suggests that the reasons for introducing the multicultural policy by the Trudeau government in 1971 was merely for political reasons, other than the ones mentioned above. He states that "practically from its beginning, multiculturalism as a policy has been saddled with what in political terms is largely an inconsequential agenda." (Lupul, 1989, p. 9). Furthermore, citing Evelyn Kallen, he wrote that:

> The introduction of the policy of multiculturalism by the Trudeau government was not an attempt to bring about profound cultural change in Canada. It was a calculated maneuver intended to maintain the economic and political status quo of this country. As a human rights scholar, Evelyn Kallen (1982:167) states: [The multicultural/bilingual policy ... was a technique of domination designed to entrench the power of the ruling Anglo elite when its superordinate, national position was threatened by Quebec's claim to political power on the one hand, and by the growing numerical and economic strength of immigrant groups on the other].

> The federal policy of multiculturalism ... was not intended to change the socio-economic structure of Canada, enabling the cultural minorities equal access to economic and political opportunity without paying the price for assimilation. Rather, the policy was intended to appease the ethnic minorities, the French-Canadian minority included; although in this case the price of appeasement was much higher.
>
> The intention was to give a little while appearing to give a lot. What was anticipated by the minorities was equal access to economic and political opportunity on equal terms, that is, without the loss of cultural identity and language. What was gained was the approval of cultural expression without any assurance of equal opportunity on equal terms. The policy of multiculturalism by this analysis was a political act meant to maintain Anglo-Celt dominance while sharing that dominance as little as necessary with the French-Canadian minority. (Lupul, 1989, pp. 9-10).

It was also noted that frustrations were becoming acute among ethnocultural groups and visible ethnics in particular, because of the difficulties faced by them in getting a foothold in Canada. Racial and ethnic tensions were on the rise. Women belonging to certain ethnocultural groups faced tremendous linguistic, cultural, racial and sexual barriers. This may be yet another factor, that has bearing on the push for multiculturalism.

After 1971, the multicultural emphasis seemed to have shifted to food fairs, festivals, carnivals, et cetera. Gauld (1991, p. 5) notes that "it [multicultural policy] dealt with cultural and integration needs as they were defined by the ethnocultural communities themselves; but it was largely left to the communities to take the initiatives."

The next major step in the shaping of the multicultural policy came in 1982, when "it [multiculturalism] was enshrined in the 1982 Constitution Act as part of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." (Multiculturalism, 1987, p. 3).

The Charter included two sub-sections that dealt specifically with multicultural concerns:

> 1. Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.
>
> 2.1 Does not preclude any law, program or activity that has as its object the amelioration of conditions of disadvantaged individuals or groups, including those that are disadvantaged because of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability. (Multiculturalism Canada, 1984, p. 8).

This incorporation was done to facilitate full participation in society of individuals of every cultural background and to foster the cultural and social potential of each Canadian community. But most importantly, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in the 1982 Constitution recognized multiculturalism for the first time in federal legislation, calling for the whole Charter to be interpreted in a way that "preserves and enhances the multicultural heritage of Canada." (Gauld, 1991, p. 6).

Another significant measure pertaining to the legislative recognition of multiculturalism was the enactment of the Canadian Multicultural Act in 1988. However, it must be noted that "multicultural policy is no longer positioned in the bilingual framework." (Gauld, 1991, p. 10).

Again, numerous reasons for the enactment were offered. One was that "equality issues facing communities were in many cases systemic and beyond the capability of the community to resolve; they required the cooperation and active involvement of government, and of Canadian institutions." (Gauld, 1991, p. 7).

The above reasons for developing a multicultural policy in 1971 and the Canadian Multicultural Act in 1988, are by no means conclusive. However, it has been demonstrated that multiculturalism has been subjected to many interpretations which have, to some extent, undermined its full potential. A. Donahoe, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Nova Scotia, notes that:

> The policy has many critics, some considering it underfunded and undirected, others declaring it divisive, patronizing or a cynical ploy. As a description of Canadian society and as public policy, however, it has had an increasingly favorable reception. (The Parliamentarian, January, 1991, p. 26).

VI. BENEFITS OF MULTICULTURALISM

Multiculturalism is seen as being of definite advantage in the modern world. It is felt that in an era where modern economies are so interdependent, multiculturalism gives Canada a distinct edge. Nurturing multiculturalism is seen also as essential to the nation's political, economic and social future.

Jim Fleming, former Minister of State for Multiculturalism, indicated the strength of multiculturalism in his speech to the fourth Conference of Multiculturalism in Ottawa. He stated that the "new global economy calls for a new type of corporate employee, someone with experience with adjusting to cultural shock." (Fleming, 1983, p. 37). Further, it calls for a "flexible cosmopolite, aware of cultural sensitivities, someone who, knowing how culture affects behavior, can motivate workers with differing standards." (Fourth Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism, 1983, p. 37).

Prime Minister Brian Mulroney saw economic advantages in multiculturalism in increasingly interdependent world economies.

In 1986, he declared that "Multiculturalism means business ... we as a nation, need to grasp the opportunity afforded us by our multicultural identity, to cement our prosperity with trade and investment links with the world and with renewed entrepreneurial spirit at home." (Multiculturalism, 1987, p. 27). He also added that "in a competitive world, technology, productivity, and quality ... determine success ... Our multicultural nature gives us an edge in selling to the world." (Multiculturalism, 1987, p. 27).

Long ago, John Stuart Mill pointed out that there is richness in diversity and that it "has generally been proportional to the amount of genius, mental vigor and moral courage." Einstein, Martin Luther King, Edison, Mandela, Pasteur, Gandhi, Freud, Gorbachev - all the great advances in human knowledge and well-being, have been made by people who thought and acted differently." (Report of the Fourth Canadian Conference, 1983, p. 36).

The academic community has also benefited from the policy of multiculturalism. Isajiw notes that:

> Many programs or projects made possible by the multicultural grants have had lasting positive effects. Looking back, one can say that before multiculturalism, ethnic studies in Canada did not amount to very much. At universities, American theoretical models and research were used to study ethnicity in Canada, and various speculative extractions had to be made to fit the Canadian scene. Today, Canadian ethnic studies have superceded many American approaches and have taken the lead on the international level. (Isajiw, 1983, p. 115).

Multiculturalism has also been beneficial to new Canadians who came as refugees. As one refugee stated:

> When you're uprooted and find yourself in a strange land where your people have no history, government-sponsored multiculturalism can be a life saver. (Winnipeg Free Press, August 14, 1991, p. 3).

Some see multiculturalism as a unifying force, in no way threatening the national sense of identity. A concerned citizen, Tyrone Nicholas, from Welland, Ontario, said:

> Multiculturalism is far from divisive. On the contrary, it brings the nation's diverse ethnic groups together by enabling them to resolve any conflicts between their traditions and their Canadian identity. This hybridization of cultures does much to strengthen patriotic feelings. Racial tensions in Canada are considerably lower than in the United States or Britain, where assimilation is actively professed. Nor does multiculturalism block some Canadians into ghettos, removed from mainstream culture. It quickens integration by helping people to keep their ethnicity while becoming fully Canadian, thus preventing new Canadians from being isolated from a distant culture. (The Toronto Star, July 1, 1991, Editorials).

Similarly, Gunther Plaut, Senior Scholar at Holy Blossom Temple in Toronto, stated that:

> Multiculturalism is more than giving children an opportunity to learn Ukrainian or Yiddish or Finnish or Vietnamese. It makes them into secure citizens, knowing that the traditions of everyone, including their own, are respected and cherished; that Canada is a nation that accords dignity to everyone, rather than suppressing peoples' identities and thereby detracting from their full sense of humanity ... At best and most successful, it diminishes the kind of racism that still exists in the land, the kind of religious prejudice, that has not gone away, and the level of xenophobia that still raises its ugly head and makes an immigrant immediately an object of suspicion. (The Globe and Mail, September 2, 1991, p. A. 16).

Since the mid-eighties and nineties, there has been movement on the federal government's part in changing the focus of its multicultural programming. The federal government has begun to pay considerably more attention to addressing issues and concerns pertaining to race relations and integration oriented activities.

VII. MULTICULTURALISM AND IDEOLOGIES

Joseph Garcea (1983, pp. 19-22), citing Evelyn Kellen (1982, pp. 54-62), notes that there are essentially three schools of thought which we believe have bearing on and have contributed to the broad range of perceptions of multiculturalism:

> The assimilationists, which range across the political spectrum from the ultra-conservatives to socialists and neo-marxists; (2) the liberal-democrats who occupy a space between the assimilationists and the pluralists; and (3) the pluralists who, despite their differences on specific points, endorse a multiculturalism policy and criticize both the assimilationists and the liberal democrats.

Garcea notes that:

> The ultra-conservative assimilationists consider multiculturalism divisive and as an impediment both to a homogeneous society, national unity, and a strong sense of nationalism. Those who hold such a view generally subscribe to the "melting pot" thesis for society and some of the more extremist members argue for very restrictive immigration practices as a means of ending ethnic demands on the system.
>
> The neo-marxists believe that multiculturalism is nothing more than a conspiracy perpetrated by established elites to mitigate against class consciousness by fostering a cultural consciousness. Furthermore, they maintain that the irony is that in Canada, cultural differences are not sufficiently pronounced or significant to constitute cultures.

The liberal-democrats constitute a third school that is skeptical about the effects of multiculturalism policy, but do not necessarily endorse assimilation. Garcea notes that:

> They [liberal-democrats] reject multiculturalism in principle because of their concern for individual rights. In their view, pluralist policies such as multiculturalism, tend to subordinate individual rights to group rights as government policies would be directed at groups rather than individuals. As such, individual rights could become a function of group rights. (Garcea, 1983, p. 21).

VIII. PERCEPTIONS OF MULTICULTURALISM

Perceptions or interpretations on multiculturalism, as it has been and is in Canada, are essentially anchored to the aforementioned ideologies as cited by Garcea.

Professor Manoly R. Lupul, (1982), in his assessment of multicultural policy of ten years argues that despite multiculturalism's many positive results, namely, recognition of minorities, efforts to integrate them into Canadian mainstream, and the provision of support systems, have not reached its full potential. An important aspect of multiculturalism is its manifestations by the Federal Government; ideological and administrative factors.

Multiculturalism did not receive the same political support as bilingualism. "Multiculturalism, unlike English-French bilingualism, has lacked the necessary political climate or atmosphere to develop beyond the superficial level." (Lupul, 1982, p. 93).

He further argues that the implementation of multiculturalism lacked a central focal base. "Multiculturalism as a policy had no status in Cabinet, no legislative base or sympathy in bureaucracy." (Lupul, 1982, p. 93). Lupul concludes that multiculturalism as government policy, from 1971 -1982, "must be termed a failure." (Lupul, 1982, p. 93).

Gilles Paquet points out that the true description of multiculturalism can be "contained pluralism". (Paquet, 1988, p. 6). Paquet notes that the 1971 "policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework is nothing but a policy of appeasement and containment designed to find an accommodation between the demands of non-French/non-British and those of French and English Canadians." (Paquet, 1988, p. 6). Paquet stresses that multiculturalism as a social policy has been, at best, a partial success. Its true worth is symbolic. "It is a contribution to the reconstruction of the symbolic system and to redistribution of social status among linguistic and ethnocultural groups in Canadian society." (Paquet, 1988, p. 6).

Describing Bill C-93 (Canadian Multiculturalism Act) during the debates in the House of Commons, Sergio Marchi, Liberal Member of Parliament, stated that " ... this Bill can be best described as a missed opportunity ... the Minister has failed to provide multiculturalism with the same government support mechanisms that were extended to official bilingualism." (Canadian Ethnocultural Council, 1988, p. 3).

While there is a movement to give credence to the philosophy of multiculturalism on the part of governments by enacting Acts, multiculturalism is still met with cynicism by academics, mainstream Canadians, and even newcomers. As one participant at the Conference on "Multiculturalism: Australian and Commonwealth Experiences and Their Implications for Other Commonwealth Countries", September 1990, noted that:

> Multiculturalism is not working perfectly in Canada. It remains a controversial subject - some believe the country should become a melting pot, others oppose this because of cost. (The Parliamentarian, January, 1991, p. 30).

Brotz (1980, p. 44), asserts that Canada is not truly multicultural and that government's policy is not genuine. He argues that:

> The policy is shallow and merely serves to project Canada as some kind of ethnic zoo where the function of the zoo keeper is to collect as many varieties as possible and exhibit them once a year in some carnival where one can go from booth to booth sampling pizzas, won ton soup, and kosher pastrami. (Brotz, 1980, p. 44).

Critics of multiculturalism, as a philosophy/concept, point out that multiculturalism has been identified with the interests of "minority" groups. Anything which is foreign or exotic implies multiculturalism, i.e., anything that does not conform to mainstream is regarded as multiculturalism. This philosophy, thus, makes multiculturalism irrelevant to the majority of Canadians and is applicable to the immigrants only. (Reeva Joshi, Rights and Responsibilities of Multiculturalism, pp. 1-2).

The ultra right view is probably best expressed by Professor Rais Khan, University of Winnipeg, who argues that multiculturalism segregates people, erects barriers and emphasizes "ghettoization". He further adds that people who wish to immigrate to Canada, but at the same time want to maintain and preserve their ethnic separatism, should remain in their native countries. However, if they wish to immigrate to Canada, they should be willing to integrate into the "Canadian way of life". He stresses that as an immigrant himself, he does not wish to have affirmative action or special treatment, but equal opportunity and rights to make and implement his freedom of choice.

Professor Khan wishes "neither to be assimilated nor to be differentiated, but to be integrated ... if I want to nurture my culture, speak my language, sing my songs ... it is my business. I should not expect government grants for that purpose nor should I get them. But at the same time, I should not be impeded from doing any or all of the above." (Khan, 1990, p. 8).

Similarly, the Reform Party of Canada, a political party which is gaining strength in membership across Canada, believes that:

> The present multicultural policy in Canada promotes the philosophy that some Canadians are more equal than others. Instead of promoting a cohesive Canada, the federal government has encouraged a ghettoization of our society and promoted hyphenated Canadianism.

> The present multicultural policy promotes practices which alienate and isolate individuals and/or groups by setting them apart from their fellow Canadians. Reformers believe federal government policies over the past 20 years have been fostering racism in Canada. (Reform Party of Canada's Multicultural Policy, 1991, p. 1).

Such views were also expressed by some participants at the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future, 1991. While there was consensus that Canada's ethnically and culturally diverse population is one of our most positive national characteristics, the way our official multicultural policy reflects this diversity was criticized. The essential complaint is that:

> We spend too much time being different and not enough being Canadian ... there should be active maintenance of cultural diversity within the country and that people's distinctiveness should be tolerated ... however, minority groups should themselves promote their own ethnic language and culture in their own homes and cultural milieu ... **THERE SHOULD NOT BE ACTIVE GOVERNMENTAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT** for the promotion of those ethnic, cultural and linguistic differences ... we do not advocate using government funding to support multicultural activities. We believe this works against unity by creating division in our society. (Citizens Forum on Canada's Future, 1991, pp. 85-86).

Howard Brotz feels that diversity is a mirage and that "Canadians of all ethnic groups, as in the United States, stand for exactly the same thing, [a bourgeois way of life]." (Brotz, 1987, p. 146). As noted earlier, he feels that "multiculturalism turns out to be a choice of pizzas, won ton soup and kosher-style pastrami sandwiches, to which one can add ethnic radio programs." (Brotz, 1987, p. 146).

Furthermore, Rosemary Brown has also warned that " ... Multiculturalism should not, and must not, be a situation where ethnic groups retain their cultural identities because they are alienated, isolated, oppressed, ostracized, categorized and manipulated on account of their particular cultural background. In other words, we must ensure and protect ourselves against multiculturalism becoming a fancy word for ghettoization." (Currents, Summer 1986, p. 5).

There also appears to be a perception among some in the ethnocultural communities - based on our experience in working with them and often seen as perpetuated by governments - that without substantial financial assistance in the form of ongoing government grants, the policy or the philosophy of multiculturalism cannot be ever realized. In other words, multiculturalism is seen as a "creature" of government.

Others, like the late John Porter, assert that official multiculturalism is cynical and possibly divisive. John Porter perhaps summed up the above view best, in his study The Vertical Mosaic, 1965. He perceived that "the notion of multiculturalism serves as a form of class control of the major power structures by the charter ethnic groups who continue to remain over-represented in the elite structures." "The issue was switched from sharing in economic and political power by substituting a cultural carrot", suggests Charles Roach. (Currents, Summer 1986, p. 5).

Western Report magazine publisher Link Byfield states:

> Multiculturalism is just a nice word for bribery ... multicultural money is often spent to try to buy the political allegiance of new Canadians. It gives leaders of these groups additional prominence in their own communities ... you just have to go to some of these multicultural festivals to see how some of these leaders fawn over the politicians who provide the grants. (The Winnipeg Sun, August 6, 1989, p. 55).

As noted above by Byfield, Isajiw in 1983, and based on our experience in working with the ethnocultural communities in Manitoba, a very common understanding of multiculturalism has been similar to the one expressed by Isajiw that:

> It [multiculturalism] consists of government grants in support of limited, temporary projects: ethnic festivals, exhibits, youth trips and the like, or support of publications, conferences, visiting professors or similar activities. (Isajiw, 1983, p. 110).

Others like Li and Bolaria (Currents, Summer 1986, p. 5) tend to view multiculturalism as "a clever government strategy of subverting attention from the essential struggle." Li and Bolaria state that, "through creating buffer institutions and funding mechanisms, the State has been successful for the most part, in de-politicizing and co-opting minority communities." (Currents, Summer 1986, p. 5).

Views similar to Li and Bolaria are still held by many Canadians.

For example, the Citizen's Forum on Canada's Future documents that:

> A great many participants see the funding of multiculturalism programs as a concrete example of the way in which the government is encouraging divisiveness through our diverse cultural origins, rather than fostering unity ... public money should not be spent to keep alive another culture. Rather, it should be the job of the cultural groups to look after preserving their own language and other aspects of their previous culture. (Citizen's Forum on Canada's Future, 1991, p. 87).

Ramcharan and others have argued that "multiculturalism has been counterproductive to the pursuit of equality ... by giving overt public support to the preservation of cultural traditions, White Canadians continue to turn a blind eye to the evidence of a racially stratified economic system." (Currents, Summer 1986, p. 5).

Similarly, Dorothy Dobbie, M.P., House of Commons, Government of Canada, at an Indo-Canadian Conference, October, 1990, Winnipeg, described the Canada's multicultural policy "as a good idea that got carried away, dividing Canadian society by emphasizing differences among cultures ... multicultural policies should be reformed to reflect more than the differences between people and cultures in Canada ... it's time to start celebrating our similarities, not our differences." (Winnipeg Free Press, October 7, 1990, pp. 1, 4).

Furthermore, Dobbie stated that:

> People have been trying to embody the concept of tolerance (through multiculturalism) but in doing so, they have alienated parts of society. (Winnipeg Free Press, October 7, 1990, p. 4).

It is clear that governments of all political stripes must examine their own commitment to the philosophy of multiculturalism. Should multiculturalism be used as a vehicle for securing "ethnic" votes by addressing "visible" ethnocultural groups' concerns and funding concerns of the "old" ethnocultural groups, or should multiculturalism be a philosophy which is reflected and promoted in all government legislations, programs and services?

In other words, should the government address multiculturalism through all public policies, in that all government policies will be sensitive to the norms and values of all Canadians?

IX. MULTICULTURALISM, THE CONSTITUTION AND THE CHARTER OF RIGHTS

The relationship between the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and multiculturalism - Sections 15 (1), (2) and 27, is also perceived by some authors as having bearing on the interpretation and credibility of multiculturalism as a national policy or as a mainstream Canadian cultural identity.

On this relationship, William Sheridan notes that:

> The entrenchment of Sections 15(1), (2) and 27 in the Canadian Constitution is really only the beginning of the relationship between multiculturalism and the Charter.
>
> The application of the law, its administration and enforcement will all depend on judicial interpretations and legal precedents over the coming years.

He also notes that, the foremost concern in this regard is the so-called "Reasonable Limits" clause in Section 1:

> The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.
>
> Conceivably this clause could be used to continue what some regard as the court's tradition of passive restraint, resulting in perhaps reluctance to fulfill the full range of promised guarantees to ethnic groups.
>
> On the other hand, the [Reasonable Limits] clause could encourage politicians to frame more precise statutes, which then could be effectively enforced on behalf of ethnic and "minority" groups. Of course, the interpretation of Section 1 will be influenced by the presence in the Charter of Section 27. We can only wait for the forthcoming judgements to set the trend. (William Sheridan, 1987, p. 11).

Another part of the Charter, which may have an equally significant impact on ethnic and "minority" rights, is the "Notwithstanding" clause:

> 33.(1) Parliament or the legislature of a province may expressly declare in an Act of Parliament or of the Legislature, as the case may be, that the Act or provision therefrom shall operate notwithstanding a provision included in Section 2 or Section 7 to 15 of this Charter.

(3) A declaration made under subsection (1) shall cease to have effect five years after it comes into force or on such earlier date as may be specified in the declaration.

(4) Parliament or a legislature of a province may reenact a declaration made under Section 1.

It is possible that Section 33, which allows Parliament or provincial legislatures to opt out of some key Charter rights, may have deleterious consequences for ethnic groups or other "minorities", exposing them to the political will of an unsympathetic majority. Hence, legislators may not necessarily be any more reliable guardians of ethnic and "minority" rights than judges have been, albeit for different reasons.

Given the "Reasonable Limits" and the "Notwithstanding" clauses, ethnic and "minority" groups are only likely to enjoy the benefits of the Charter's rights and freedoms if they remain vigilant about exposing infringements, and if they actively seek remedies from both judges and politicians

The lack of recognition of multiculturalism in the Canadian Constitution as a substantive and independent clause is also of grave concern to the ethnocultural communities. They are concerned that multiculturalism is restricted to the interpretations of the courts; multiculturalism is interpreted based on the sensitivity of the judges. Professor Hogg notes that Section 27 is "merely an interpretive section conferring no substantive guarantees."

However, he does say that, "the provision of Section 27 may affect how the courts interpret the "free and democratic" society provision in Section 1." (Multiculturalism and the Charter, 1987, p. 35).

Similarly, another writer, in terms of the application of Section 27, states that:

> One can easily note that Section 27, by its term, does not claim to constitute an original source of individual rights and freedoms. Instead, this section constitutes a rule of interpretation by which rights guaranteed under the Charter provisions can be determined. It will not constitute in itself a springboard to attack laws, regulations and policies which are perceived as prejudicial to a cultural diversity ... and in this respect, it seems that one can to a certain degree justify considering Section 27 as a simple declaration of principle which will produce no effect. (Multiculturalism and the Charter, 1987, p. 35).

Most ethnocultural community organizations are of the view that the present recognition of multiculturalism, as in Section 27 of the Charter, is inadequate and ambiguous. Ethnocultural communities strongly believe that the multicultural nature of Canada must be recognized in the preamble of the Canadian Constitution as one of the fundamental characteristics of Canadian identity, as articulated in the final report of the Province of Manitoba's Task Force on Meech Lake Accord. The Task Force recommended that the preamble of the Canadian Constitution must be amended to include the "Canada" clause.

> The Constitution Act, 1867, is amended by adding thereto, immediately after Section 1 thereof, the following section:
>
> 2.(1) The Constitution of Canada shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the recognition that the following constitute fundamental characteristics of Canada:
>
> (e) The existence of Canada's multicultural heritage comprising many origins, creeds and cultures. (Manitoba Task Force on Meech Lake, 1989, p. 72).

The Manitoba Intercultural Council, as well as other organizations representing ethnocultural communities, have strongly contended that our linguistic duality should not be above the multicultural aspect of our Canadian identity. The question is:

> Should multiculturalism issues be decided by the courts or by parliament and legislators?

X. MULTICULTURALISM: NEW CANADIANS, CHARTER GROUPS AND ABORIGINALS

The ethnocultural communities and new Canadians hold the view that the governments have not done a good job of explaining to the public what multiculturalism really means.

Joe Glasgow, Past Chairperson of the Manitoba Intercultural Council, 1987-91, notes that "it's not just for visible minorities ... multiculturalism is for all of us." (Winnipeg Free Press, August, 14, 1991, p. 3).

The complaint is that governments have through omission or commission continued to present multiculturalism in its 1960's and 1970's version, which focused on cultural and heritage oriented issues, as abnormal to the Canadian mainstream culture. Issues such as employment, racial discrimination, equality of opportunity and so on are of more immediate concern. This criticism continues, even though the Federal Government has been shifting some of its attention to issues of race relations and combatting discrimination.

> They [new Canadians] would prefer to see available public funds spent on language training and other forms of integration assistance for newcomers to Canada, rather than on heritage culture preservation ... this means providing funding for special programs where they are needed and insuring that human rights are upheld for all citizens. We need to forego wasteful extravaganzas in favor of effective programs to help integrate rather than assimilate newcomers into Canadian society. (Citizen's Forum on Canada's Future, 1991, p. 87).

Groups such as the Aboriginal people and the French, in the past and at present, continue to take exception to the policy of multiculturalism. The Aboriginal people were apprehensive about the 1971 Multicultural Policy, for they perceive multiculturalism as a "negation of that tenuous and/or illusory "special status" when included under the rubric of a multiculturalism policy which threatens to place them on equal footing with immigrants." (Garcea, 1979, p. 17).

The Aboriginal people of Canada argued that:

> The multicultural policy is not beneficial because it is more symbolism than substance which focuses too much on [folkloric] rather than meeting their day-to-day socio-economic and political needs. (Kelner and Kellen, 1974, p. 26 (cited in) Garcea 1979, p. 18).

The French Canadians, particularly Quebecers, in the mid-seventies and today, while insisting that multiculturalism be recognized in a bilingual context, continue to have reservations regarding multiculturalism. Rocher, a Quebecer, (R. Hebert, 1988, p. 6), suggests that:

> First, this new concept of Canadian society seriously jeopardizes the future of bilingualism. The second reason is one of practicality. Thirty percent of the population of Canada is French-speaking. These Canadians, wherever they live, must be able to deal with their government in their own language. My third reservation is to do with multiculturalism itself. I do not think nationhood can be founded on multiculturalism. Canada, as the Trudeau government defines it, no longer has a clearly identifiable cultural nucleus. It is a kind of Grand Central Station for all nations of the world, and regardless of their numerical importance, they are all entitled to the recognition and financial support of the Canadian government. My fourth and last reservation is that the new multicultural policy represents a retrograde step, as far as French-Canadians are concerned, although they have not yet realized it. By separating bilingualism from biculturalism, the Trudeau government is betraying all the hopes French-Canadians might have placed in bilingualism, as they conceived it - that is, clearly tied to its symbol and essential condition, biculturalism.

Francophones outside Quebec shared many of those same concerns identified by Rocher.

As one author explains, many of them felt that " ... while biculturalism, which does not recognize other cultural groups, is too narrow ... a concept of multiculturalism which puts all cultural groups on the same footing is much too broad." (Jaworsky, 1979, p. 84 (cited in) Garcea, 1983, p. 17). The Federation of Francophones Outside Quebec concluded that the bilingual multicultural concept of Canada is a threat to their cultural identity because it pushes them " ... too easily and subtly to the background, to the same level as any other ethnic minority." (Jaworsky, 1979, p. 86 (cited in) Garcea, 1983, p. 17).

The Province of Quebec, from the very beginning, has been very skeptical, if not hostile, to multiculturalism. As documented by Parel (1988, p. 133), Premier Robert Bourassa expressed his concerns to Pierre E. Trudeau, then Prime Minister, in 1971, that:

> You will have noticed that Quebec does not accept your government's approach to the principle of multiculturalism. Actually, the concept seems scarcely compatible with the facts of Quebec, where the predominant population group is linguistically and culturally French, where the large minority is linguistically and culturally English, and where there are many minorities having other linguistic and cultural origins. In a word, with the federal government assuming responsibilities for all cultures which are to be found in Canada, Quebec must take on, within its own territory, the role of the prime defender of the French language and culture. The Government of Quebec feels that it has a special responsibility for spreading the French culture in North America and it proposes to do this with all the means at its disposal. (Parel, 1988, p. 133).

XI. PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS' PERCEPTION OF MULTICULTURALISM

From the available literature and MIC's correspondence with provincial governments on multiculturalism, it is evident that the ideology/philosophy of multiculturalism is still a nebulous term awaiting a consistent unitary interpretation. (For more detail, see Appendix 2).

The Province of Manitoba's Task Force on Multiculturalism, 1988, in its report noted that:

> A cursory examination of relevant legislation on multicultural affairs in the Canadian provinces suggest that, while commitment to the general principles of equality, fairness, tolerance, cultural preservation and appreciation of all cultures is present everywhere, efforts by governments to develop a policy on multiculturalism and to enact legislation to support these principles vary considerably. (Manitoba Task Force on Multiculturalism, 1988, p. 17).

For example, while the purposes of the multicultural policies of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan puts emphasis on the enhancement and preservation of culture, the Provinces of Ontario, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia and Manitoba address multiculturalism based on the principles of human rights.

On the other hand, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador believes that the concept or philosophy of multiculturalism is only applicable or required if the population is heterogeneous.

Eric A. Gullage, Newfoundland's Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, states that:

> Our government does not have a multicultural policy or Act. We consider multiculturalism to be the mandate of the Federal Government of Canada ... less than one-half of one percent of our population are non-Anglo-Saxon, Newfoundland-born. Despite the fact that Newfoundland is not a multicultural society, our Department of Education has inserted multicultural matters in the school system so that Newfoundlanders can have a broad perspective on the Canadian situation and can be open to cross-cultural understanding.
>
> The people of Newfoundland enjoy the most indigenous European culture in Canada, with the exception of Quebec, and people of all cultures who come to make their home here, are accepted as Newfoundlanders, and enjoy all of the rights and freedoms which that entails. Thank goodness, ethnic prejudice and job discrimination are not major problems in this province. (Correspondence - Eric A. Gullage, Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, August 1, 1989).

XII. THE ONGOING CHALLENGE

The aforementioned perceptions/interpretations and criticisms of multiculturalism as it has evolved in Canada since 1971, show that the jury is still out on a more precise definition or at least on developing a greater understanding of what multiculturalism is and where should it as a national and provincial policy be directed at in the 1990's and beyond.

It should be evident that the concept of multiculturalism is basically relegated to an issue subject to moral and intellectual questions: moral in the sense of addressing the concerns of newcomers who are predominantly preoccupied with "bread and butter issues", while those of second, third and fourth generations in Canada are preoccupied in "rediscovering" their ethnicity.

Intellectual in the sense that many are still grappling with cross-cultural sensitivity and integration oriented issues, together with a concern that multiculturalism may be promoting "ghettoization" of ethnic groups, which insulates groups and promotes racism.

While there is considerable confusion, cynicism, debate and earnest soul searching about multiculturalism in Canada, Isajiw, as early as 1983, wisely suggested a useful definition and basis for an ongoing interpretation that:

> It is a way of combatting ethnic and racial prejudice and discrimination. In this view, multiculturalism is a set of attitudes and values, which indicate that discrimination is illegal, that prejudice is socially injurious because ultimately it denies us all of the possibility of having a fair chance, the minority ethnic groups want the same things as everybody else - a good job, a decent place to live, a chance to better oneself educationally and in other ways - that it is better to live in harmony than discord, and that, therefore, tolerance in social relations should be practiced, and so on. (Isajiw, 1983, p. 112).

The aforementioned concept provides this nation a challenge and an opportunity to accommodate the concerns of all Canadians, whether they be new or more established, with ancestors from North America, Europe or elsewhere on the planet. As noted earlier, recently, the federal and provincial governments, to some extent, are focusing their multicultural policies in that direction, however, they are still in the preliminary stages awaiting implementation and evaluation. The challenge still remains as to where multiculturalism should be directed and how it should be communicated to Canadians.

It appears that the principal reason why multiculturalism is constantly "attacked", is due to a lack of understanding about the philosophy of multiculturalism. Isajiw, noted, as early as 1983, that:

> The root of the problem in regard to the government's position on multiculturalism is a strong suspicion that those who issued the policy in the first place and those who administer it may not themselves believe in the philosophy behind the policy, that is, in the very principle on which the policy is based: the idea that in Canada there is no one [official culture, nor does any ethnic group take precedence over any other,] and that [natural unity, if it is to mean anything in a deeply personal sense, must be founded on confidence in one's own individual identity; out of this can grow respect for that of others and willingness to share ideas, attitudes and assumptions.] (Isajiw, 1983, p. 116).

The Edmonton Social Planning Council recently noted that:

> Part of the problem of the confusion in multicultural policy certainly stems from the division of jurisdiction inherent in the system of Canadian Confederation. When multiculturalism is seen as a broad social policy, responsibilities for supervision of policy and for service delivery fall into both government camps ... for example, both branches of government [federal and provincial] have divisions responsible for multiculturalism. (Faid, 1989, p. 5).
>
> Part of the problem at the federal level, is that the Canadian Government has never fully resolved the issue brought up by the 1962 Royal Commission. Is Canada a bicultural nation or a multicultural nation? How does multiculturalism fit into bilingualism? How will multiculturalism fit into the [distinct society] of Quebec, as [it was] defined in the proposed [Meech Lake Accord] Constitutional amendment? As long as these issues are not addressed, the confusion [about multiculturalism] will remain. (Faid, 1989, p. 6).

At the provincial level, the Edmonton Social Planning Council notes that in terms of multiculturalism, at least in the case of Alberta:

> Emphasis has been overly much on cultural issues, most of the ethnic integration falls not under the Department of Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism, but in others - discrimination with the Alberta Human Rights Commission, immigration and settlement and English as a Second Language with Career Development and Employment, and heritage languages with Education and Advanced Education. The fragmentation of responsibility again creates more confusion. (Faid, 1989, pp. 5 - 6).

However, it must be noted that there is presently a trend at provincial levels to try to address the above. For example, the Governments of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec have all centralized "multicultural" and immigrant settlement oriented programs under one department. The Government of Manitoba recently renamed its Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, to "Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship".

It is obvious that Manitobans and Canadians alike must ask themselves this question:

> Should multiculturalism as an issue only come to the fore during pre-election time, or should it deserve the same recognition as any other public policy issue?

They must also question their own commitment to multiculturalism. For instance,

> What role does government financial assistance play in realizing multiculturalism in Canada? To what extent should multiculturalism in a [cultural retention and preservation] context be addressed by the government and to what extent should the [community] groups or individuals address it themselves?

Furthermore, questions posed by Isajiw in 1983 in his informative article, Multiculturalism and the Integration of the Canadian Community, should also be considered. These questions are very important to ask or consider, if we are to address and "fine tune" the philosophy and especially the policy and the practice of multiculturalism:

1) Has the policy of multiculturalism so far helped to fulfill the needs and interests of the minority - ethnic groups?

2) Considering the fact that the policy was established by a mainstream institution, to what extent has this institution moved to bring the minority into the mainstream of society?

3) To what extent has the majority group, particularly its power elite, accepted the idea and the policy of multiculturalism as a policy of maintaining unity or integrating Canadian society?

4) To what extent has the elite shown willingness to accommodate the minority groups, with their peculiar needs, interests and demands in the mainstream institutions of society?

Governments at all levels in consultation with the public should be active in developing a meaningful definition and a more consistent interpretation of multiculturalism, or else they should relegate it to the wastebasket of history and start again with yet another concept, but this time, with greater and more honest commitment and with wisdom gleaned from the many lessons of a most interesting political and social experiment by a nation who tried.

XIII. CONCLUSION

Multiculturalism in Canada, since officially adopted as policy in 1971 and as an Act in 1988, has been and continues to be a topic of vigorous debate, subjected to various interpretations and has provided a challenge to governments to develop a meaningful public policy.

For some, Europeans, multiculturalism has meant the preservation of ones' cultural heritage, while for others, predominantly "visible ethnic" and new Canadians, it has meant promoting equality in the context of race relations and human rights. For governments, the challenge has been to find the balance between the two and develop a meaningful public policy for all Canadians.

For the past twenty years, as perceived by many, multicultural policy has been synonymous with ethnic songs and dances, heritage languages, special costumes and foods. Race relations component of the multicultural policy has only recently been revived by both federal and provincial governments. As a result Paquet (1988, p. 12) notes, "it cannot be said that the multicultural policy has done as much as it might have to nurture an ethnic or race-relations policy in Canada. Rather, it has, up to now, emphasized rather ethnocentrism and segmentation with unintended consequences of some import."

Today, these "unintended consequences of some import" are the factors fueling the current debate on multiculturalism. The debate hardly ever involves denouncing the intent of multiculturalism, but it questions matters such as use of public funds to assist ethnocultural groups to enhance and preserve their cultural heritage, and the way the governments are implementing and delivering the multicultural policy. Furthermore, the definition, or lack of it, is also considered to be germane to this debate.

The critics argue that the state should not be involved in funding ethnocultural groups for such purposes and that such activities should be the responsibility of the ethnocultural communities. Another criticism is that the focus of multiculturalism is still in the 1970's context, which is no longer desired with that intensity in the 1990's and beyond.

Multicultural policy must be redefined so it is interpreted consistently and its programs must also be redirected to address concerns pertaining to race-relation and human rights. On the other hand, as with any philosophy/ideology and public policy, continuous redefinition of policy and regular redirection of resources is essential.

What is needed of multiculturalism in the 1990's and beyond is an understanding as to what multiculturalism truly means and how Canadians could benefit from it as a national and provincial policy. Otherwise the prevailing atmosphere of mistrust arising out of misinterpretations, misperceptions and even misrepresentations will continue to haunt us. Addressing the questions posed by Isajiw in 1983, the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future, and as outlined in this report would be an indispensable start to any lasting of new understanding of multiculturalism.

It is not recommended that governments should withdraw completely from funding cultural preservation oriented programs, rather, it is suggested that integration, "settlement" and programs combatting racism and discrimination should be emphasized by governments at the federal and provincial level.

While the federal government has recently changed its programming more towards race relations and in the human rights context to facilitate the integration of new Canadians in the economic and social milieu, much more action and result oriented, instead of politically determined, programs are needed.

While implications for multiculturalism at the municipal level is not discussed in this paper, it does not mean that they should not get involved. To discuss such implications would certainly warrant another paper. Such a paper would be very timely, since many ethnocultural communities, across Canada, have alleged that they encounter difficulties with the police and face many barriers in obtaining employment with the municipal government.

It should be obvious that multiculturalism should not be just about cultural retention of individual ethnic groups, but a political, social and economic integration of all groups. Professor Banks (1988, p. 8) aptly suggests that "Westernized nation-states will be able to create societies with overarching goals that are shared by all groups only when these groups feel that they have a real stake and a place in their nation-states and that their states mirror their concerns, values, and ethos."

Multiculturalism as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian identity must also be expressed in the preamble of the Canadian Constitution. Furthermore, clause dealing with multiculturalism in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms be made an independent clause, rather than its present interpretative clause status.

Any policy, including the one of multiculturalism, is meaningless if it does not meet the expectations and aspirations of our citizens, regardless of one's race, religion, ethnic origin or background, if it does not fully involve them in both the development and implementation of the policies and programs emanating from it, if it does not add to the quality of life for all Canadians, and if it is not based on a realistic view of the political, social, cultural, and economic circumstances of our nation.

Afterall, what has been of debate is not the multicultural policy, rather its programs, and that can be fixed. Dr. Rey Pagtakhan (1991, p. 7), first Member of Parliament of Filipino descent, in reference to the various prevailing sentiments criticizing multiculturalism notes:

> If there are any shades of truth to any of the sentiments, then something is wrong with the government in how it has implemented policy, not with the people. If multiculturalism has been warped it is because of policy, short-circuited by poor application. Multiculturalism must be first and foremost about joining hands and saying, "We are all equal; together, we are stronger".

The implications for the policy makers, at the federal, provincial and municipal level are clear - to develop multiculturalism itself as a unifying factor for all communities, under the umbrella of Canadian unity and nationalism. All attempts must be made to ensure that "multiculturalism" is not perceived by Canadians as a policy to address concerns of "newcomers" or "visible ethnics", rather, it should be a policy for all Canadians.

XIV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abella, Judge R. Equality in Employment. Ottawa: Research Studies for Equality in Employment, 1985.

Arnold, Abraham. "Canada's Subtle Brand of Racism Still in Evidence." Winnipeg Free Press, February 20, 1990, p. 7.

Anderson, Alan, and Frideres, James S. Ethnicity in Canada: Theoretical Perspectives. Toronto: Butterworths, 1981.

Banks, James. Model for Curriculum Reform. Educational Materials and Services Centre, 1988.

Bolaria, S. B., and Li, S. P. Racial Oppression in Canada. Toronto: Gramond Press, 1985.

Brotz, H. Multiculturalism in Canada: A Model. 1980, 6 Canadian Public Policy 41, (cited in) Canadian Human Rights Foundation. Multiculturalism and the Charter: A Legal Perspective. The Carswell Company Limited, 1987, p. 146.

Bullivant, B. Multiculturalism - Pluralist Orthodoxy or Ethnic Hegemony. Canadian Ethnic Studies, Vol. 13:2, 1981.

Canada. House of Commons. Debates. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, October, 1971 (cited in) Canadian Human Rights Foundation. Multiculturalism and the Charter: A Legal Perspective. The Carswell Company Limited, 1987, p. 64.

Canada. Multiculturalism Canada. Multiculturalism and the Government of Canada. Ottawa: Minister of State, Multiculturalism, 1984.

Canadian Ethnocultural Council. Multiculturalism Act - Bill C-93, Ottawa, 1988.

Canadian Human Rights Foundation. Multiculturalism and the Charter: A Legal Perspective. The Carswell Company Limited, 1987.

Chan, Kwok B., and Helly, Denise. Coping with Racism: A Century of the Chinese Experience in Canada. Canadian Ethnic Studies, XIX, 3, 1987.

Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1991.

Cryderman, K. B., and O'Toole, Chris N. Police, Race and Ethnicity: A Guide for Law Enforcement Officers. Toronto: Butterworths, 1986.

CURRENTS. Readings in Race Relations: Canadian Origins of Apartheid? Published by the Urban Alliance on Race Relations, Vol. 3, No. 4, Summer 1986.

Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation. Multiculturalism is for All Manitobans: Towards a Horizontal Mosaic. Report Submitted by the Manitoba Task Force on Multiculturalism, 1988.

Department of the Secretary of State of Canada. Multiculturalism. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services Canada, 1987.

Department of the Secretary of State. Multiculturalism Bill C - 93. Ottawa: Department of the Secretary of State, 1987.

Department of the Secretary of State of Canada. International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Tenth Report of Canada. 1990.

Douglas, John, and Campbell, Donald. "Epp Cries Racism Over Forks." Winnipeg Free Press, March 18, 1990, pp. 1, 4.

Federation of Canadian Municipalities. "Dealing with Diversity: Multicultural Access to Local Government." Race Relations Series #2. Municipal Race Relations Program, 1988.

Faid, P. Developing Multicultural Policy: The Community's Policy: The Government's Response to Government Inertia. Presented at the 10th Biennial Conference of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association, Calgary, October 18-20, 1989.

Fagan, Drew. "Suggested Measures to End System's Racism May Prove too Radical." Globe and Mail, January 29, 1990, p. A4.

Gall, G. L. Multiculturalism and Fundamental Freedoms: Section 27 and Section 2, (cited in) Canadian Human Rights Foundations. Multiculturalism and the Charter: A Legal Perspective. The Carswell Company Limited, 1987.

Garcea, Joseph. Canada's Multiculturalism Policy: A Skeleton in Search of a Body, An Animating Spirit, and a Home Within Federalism. 1983. (Unpublished Paper).

Gauld, Greg. Conference on Canadian Studies, "Twenty Years of Multiculturalism: Successes and Failures", February 28 - March 2, 1991, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Goldhust, John, and Richmond, Anthony. A Multivariate Analysis of the Economic Adaptation of Immigrants in Toronto. Institute of Behavioral Research, York University, 1973.

Graham, Heidi, and Flood, Gerald. "Klan Costumes Spark Controversy." Winnipeg Free Press, April 1, 1989, pp. 1, 4.

Gullage, E. A. Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, August 1, 1989. (Correspondence with Vijay Sharma, Policy Analyst, Manitoba Intercultural Council).

Hawkins, F. Canadian Multiculturalism: The Policy Explained. Amsterdam: Free University Press, 1988.

Head, Wilson. The Black Presence in the Canadian Mosaic. Report Submitted to the Ontario Human Rights Commission, 1975.

Hebert, Raymond-M. Multiculturalism in Manitoba: A Francophone Perspective. Paper presented at a conference on "The Constitution and Multiculturalism in Manitoba", organized by the Canadian Human Rights Foundation, Winnipeg, March 24 and 25, 1988.

Henry, Frances. Race Relations Research in Canada Today: A State of the Art Review. Prepared for the Canadian Human Rights Commission Colloquium on Racial Discrimination, 1986.

_____ . The Dynamics of Racism in Toronto. Department of the Secretary of State. Ottawa, Canada, 1978.

Henry, F. and Ginzberg, E. Who Gets the Work: A Test of Racial Discrimination in Toronto. Urban Alliance on Race Relations and Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto, 1985.

Hill, G. D., and Schiff, M. Human Rights in Canada. Second Edition. A Focus on Racism. The Canadian Labour Congress and the Human Rights Research and Education Centre, University of Ottawa.

Hornblower, Margot. "Foreign Overdose", TIME, July 15, 1991, p. 26.

Hughes, D., and Kallen, E. The Anatomy of Racism. Montreal: Harvest House, 1974.

Hurst, Lynda. "Bigots? Who Us?." Winnipeg Sun, April 1, 1990.

Isajiw, Wsevolod W. Multiculturalism and the Integration of the Canadian Community. Canadian Ethnic Studies, Vol. XV, No. 2, 1983.

Jain, H. Race and Sex Discrimination in the Workplace: An Analysis of Theory Research and Public Policy in Canada. Ottawa: Employment and Immigration, 1981.

Jaworsky, J. A Case Study of the Canadian Federal Government's Multiculturalism Policy. M. A. Thesis, Carleton University, 1979.

Joshee, R. Rights and Responsibilities of Multiculturalism. (Unpublished paper).

Kallen, Evelyn. "Multiculturalism: Ideology, Policy, and Reality." Journal of Canadian Studies, Vol. 17:1, Spring, 1982.

Kelner, M., and Kallen, E. "The Multicultural Policy: Canada's Response to Ethnic Diversity." Journal of Comparative Ideology, No. 22, 1974.

Khan, A. R. Multiculturalism and Canadian Unity. (Unpublished paper, 1990).

LaRocque, Emma. "Racism Runs Through Canadian Society." Winnipeg Free Press, April 26, 1989, p. 7.

Locher, Uli. Racial Disadvantage of West Indians of Montreal. Anthropologie et Sociétés, 1981.

Lupul, M. The Political Implementation of Multiculturalism. Journal of Canadian Studies 17, No. 1, 1982.

_____. Networking, Discrimination and Multiculturalism as a Social Philosophy. Canadian Ethnic Studies, Vol. XXI, No. 2, 1989.

Marr, William. Labour Market and Other Implications of Immigration Policy for Ontario. Toronto: Ontario Economic Council, 1976.

Martin, Nick. "Trustees' Racism Report Panned." Winnipeg Free Press, July 31, 1989, p. 3.

Montgomery, Catherine. "Community-based Social Services: Blacks Looking After Blacks." Horizons - Interculturels, Publication de l' Institut Interculturel de Montreal, No. 20, September 1990, pp. 15-17.

Multiculturalism Canada. Multiculturalism and the Government of Canada, Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1984.

Pagtakhan, Rey. Multiculturalism: An Instrument of Canadian Unity. Filipino Journal, August 1991.

Palmer, H. Immigration and the Rise of Multiculturalism. Toronto: Copp Clarke, 1975.

Paquet, G. Multiculturalism as a National Policy. Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 1988.

Parel, Anthony. The Meech Lake Accord and Indo-Canadians. Canadian Ethnic Studies, XX, 1, 1988, p. 133.

Passaris, Constantine. The Immigration Cure. Policy Options, Vol. 10, No. 5, June, 1989.

Patel, Dhiru. Dealing With Interracial Conflict: Policy Alternatives. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1980.

Pitman, Walter. Now is Too Late. Report Submitted to the Council of Metropolitan Toronto by the Task Force on Human Relations, 1977.

Porter, John. The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Report of the Fourth Canadian Conference on Multiculturalism. The Second Decade of Multiculturalism: Opportunity for the Future. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services Canada, 1983.

Richmond, Anthony, and Ravi, Verma. Income Inequality In Canada: Ethnic and Generational Aspects. Canadian Studies in Population, 1978.

Rocher, Guy. "Multiculturalism: The Doubts of a Francophone." Multiculturalism as a State Policy, Compiled by the C.C.C.M. Ottawa: Supply and Services, 1976.

Rutter, Frank. "The Multicultural Bomb is Exploding Around the World." The SUN, Vancouver, June 27, 1991, p. A3.

St. Germain, Pat. "Anti-Semitism Grows." Winnipeg Sun, February 20, 1990, p. 3.

Schlesinger, Arthur. "The Cult of Ethnicity, Good and Bad." TIME, July 8, 1991, p. 14.

Sheridan, William. Canadian Multiculturalism: Issues and Trends. Ottawa: The Research Branch of the Library of Parliament, 1987.

Special Committee on Visible Minorities in Canadian Society. Equality Now! Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1984.

Thampi, Radha Krishnan. "Racial Storm Brewing Over Council 'Assaults'." Winnipeg Free Press, April 5, 1990, pp. 1, 4.

The Globe and Mail. "Protecting the Seeds of a New Tomorrow." September 3, 1991, p. A16.

The Parliamentarian. January, 1991, p. 26. MULTICULTURALISM: Australian and Commonwealth Experiences and Their Implications for Other Commonwealth Countries. Panel C, September 19, 1990.

Winnipeg Free Press. January 9, 1991, p. 12.

_____ . "Italians, Jews Fight Racism." April 2, 1990, p. 11.

_____ . "Attacks on Jews Increase." February 20, 1990, p. 14.

_____ . "Ethnic Leaders Divided On Multiculturalism". August, 14, 1991, p. 3.

_____ . "Multiculturalism Policy Divisive, Dobbie Says." October 7, 1990. pp. 1, 4.

Winnipeg Sun. "Canadian Multiculturalism or American Melting Pot". August 6, 1989, p. 55.